

Remarks

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

The claims are rejected as being anticipated by Kawamura.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

The claims are rejected as being obvious over Kawamura in view of Baker.

Discussion of the Examiner's Interpretation of Kawamura

Applicant respectfully maintains that the Examiner's statements regarding Kawamura are incorrect. The Examiner maintains that Kawamura teaches a "mixing material conducting arrangement for conducting through the evaporator medium (10) at least a portion of the mixing material provided for mixture formation". This interpretation of Kawamura is incorrect.

In Kawamura's liquid fuel burner, (formerly liquid) fuel atomized in an atomizing chamber 7 filled with a fiber wick 10 enters a combustion chamber 6 through atomizing holes 3 and air is blown through air introducing holes 17 and 20 into the combustion chamber 6, where the atomized fuel is mixed with the air and this mixture is combusted. Hence, Kawamura's mixing material is air and Kawamura's mixing material conducting arrangement comprises the air intake pipe 12, the air introducing path 25 and the air introducing holes 17 and 20, which penetrate the combustion cylinder 11 and not the fiber wick 10, which is correctly identified by the Examiner with the evaporator medium as cited in Applicant's claims. Further, the only supply duct leading into the atomizing chamber 7 is the fuel feed pipe 16, and there is no way that air can pass through the fiber wick 10. Therefore, air cannot be conducted through Kawamura's evaporator medium.

In other words, Kawamura's mixing material conducting arrangement does not conduct through the evaporator medium 10 at least a portion of the mixing material."

As should be clear from the above discussion, the "small apertures through the wick material" cannot be mixing material passage apertures and the Examiner's statement regarding claim 2 is also incorrect. As there is no flow of mixing material through the evaporator medium, the heating device can be arranged (in relation to the flow of mixing material through the evaporator medium 10) neither on an upstream side nor on a downstream side of the evaporator medium and the Examiner's statement regarding claim 4 is also incorrect.

Given the basic issues regarding the Examiner's interpretation of Kawamura and the claims, the above arguments also apply to the remainder of the claim rejections in comparison to Kawamura. The Examiner's arguments regarding claims 12-15 cannot be valid because these arguments are based on the validity of the Office Action's statements regarding claim 1.

Applicant respectfully maintains that the claims should be allowable in comparison to a correct interpretation of Kawamura.

Wherefore further consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

A three-month extension of time in which to respond to the outstanding Office Action is hereby requested. PTO-2038 authorizing credit card payment for the amount of \$1,020 is enclosed for the prescribed Large Entity three-month extension fee.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Robert Kestenbaum
Reg. No. 20,430
11011 Bermuda Dunes NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87111
Phone (505) 323-0771
Fax (505) 323-0865

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to Mail Stop 1764, Amendment with Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 05/02/2007.



M. Robert Kestenbaum